

Legislature for the substitution of the existing Press Act by another on the lines of the Act in force in British India. He thanked the Government for having promptly acted on the representations of the Assembly and the Council. One of the members who had spoken earlier on this question had preferred a similar request at the previous session of the House. The speaker was surprised to find that on the present occasion that very member had opposed the measure vehemently. He felt that the restrictions complained of by the oppositionists existed even under the present law. Even under the proposed measure, there was no reason to suppose that the courts of law would demand heavy securities in each and every case. For these reasons, he did not believe that honest journalists would have anything to fear even if the proposed measure was enacted.

Some members had said that the Press should not be subjected to any restriction whatsoever. Personally he would also be glad if such a state of affairs prevailed. He agreed that the Press in Mysore was doing meritorious service to the country. But there was no guarantee that the same state of affairs would prevail in future also. Occasions might arise when each newspaper might act as it liked. If a paper spread sensational news or carried on mischievous propaganda, was it to be let off even then? After all, the responsibility for maintaining law and order rested on the Government and it was their duty to call erring editors to order if necessity for such action arose.

Some members had pleaded for Mysore emulating the examples of certain advanced western countries.

He would personally prefer to emulate the examples of neighbouring administrations. Congress Ministries were in power in 7 out of the 11 British Indian provinces. Had any one of these Ministries, he would ask, done away with the Press Act altogether? Again, there was a clash between Hindus and Muslims in the Bombay Presidency recently. Had not the Congress Ministry there imposed certain restrictions on the Press at that time? The needs of the situation then demanded such action being taken. And supposing unfortunately such occasions arose in the State, it was but reasonable to expect the Government of Mysore in such circumstances to have the power to control the Press within reasonable limits. If the Government exercised the power then it would not be said that they were unnecessarily interfering with the liberties and privileges of the Press. There need be no apprehension on the part of anybody that simply because a law like this was on the Statute Book the Government would be eager to enforce its provisions indiscriminately. On the other hand, the mere existence of such a law would keep the editors within the limits of caution, and the Press itself would be run on healthy lines. From this point of view, it would be very unfair to the Government if anybody attributed motives to them in connection with the present measure. Personally he did not see that the proposed measure would be detrimental to any honest editor.

At this stage the House rose (at 5-5 p.m.) to meet again at 12 of the clock the following day.

SECOND DAY.

Saturday, 11th June 1938.

The House reassembled at the Jagan Mohan Palace Pavilion on Saturday, 11th June 1938, at 12 of the clock, Mr. President (*Amin-ul-Mulk* Sir Mirza M. Ismail, K.C.I.E., O.B.E., Dewan) in the Chair.

Before the business of the day was taken up, Mr. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR represented that there was a change effected subsequent to the arrangement that

had been made at the commencement of the session with regard to the seating accommodation to Congress members. He wanted that as on the first day a separate block should be earmarked for the members of the Congress Party and a board also put up to indicate that that block was reserved exclusively for the members of that party.

The **PRESIDENT** replied that the arrangements for accommodation would be improved, but that it was not usual in the case of Houses of Legislature to put up placards to indicate that particular seats were reserved for particular groups.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS—*contd.*

Bifurcation of the Mysore District Board.

Q.—14. Mr. K. C. SUBBANNA, Gundlupet Taluk.—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) the period for which local bodies are usually constituted;

(b) when was the Mysore District Board constituted;

(c) have not the Government already announced that the present term of the Mysore District Board is to be terminated on 1st September 1938?

A.—The **SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT** (Mr. P. H. Krishna Rao).—

(a) Three years.

(b) The Mysore District Board was reconstituted for a period of three years from 1st September 1936.

(c) Yes, but Government have since issued orders that the bifurcation of the Mysore District Board will come into effect from 1st September 1939 instead of from 1st September 1938 as previously ordered. (*Vide* Notification No. L. 8580/L.B. 102-37-4, dated 19th April 1938).

Mr. K. C. SUBBANNA.—It is not clear from the answer why the term of the district board was ordered to be terminated earlier than the prescribed period.

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—It is competent for the Government to do so under the District Boards Act.

Mr. K. C. SUBBANNA.—May I know under what section of the Act, the Government had taken action?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—Notice.

Mr. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Has not the section of the Act dealing with

the termination of the term been mentioned in the order?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—It might have been, but the order is not in my hands just now.

Mr. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA.—Once the term of office of the board has been prescribed as three years, is it open to the Government to order its termination earlier?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—The Act says that the term of the board shall "ordinarily" be three years.

The **SECOND MEMBER** (Rajamantravina N. Madhava Rau).—When the district board itself is bifurcated, it ceases to exist and the members no longer continue.

Mr. K. L. NANJAPPA NADIG.—After passing the order under reference, did not the Government notify fresh elections and also call for separate voters' lists from each taluk?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—Government did not issue any notification. The Deputy Commissioner did it.

Mr. K. L. NANJAPPA NADIG.—Why, then, elections were not held?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—On reconsideration, it was thought unnecessary to hold the elections.

Mr. K. L. NANJAPPA NADIG.—Why should the question have been reconsidered at all? Does it mean that the case had not been considered fully when the order was issued?

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU.—At the time the order was issued, it was considered necessary to hold the elections; but subsequently, it was found to be inexpedient.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Is it not a fact that under the Act the Government have power, if at all, to extend the term of office of a district board and not to reduce it?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—When the term prescribed is ordinarily three